Smooth digraphs modulo primitive positive constructability and cyclic loop conditions
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Smooth digraphs, that is, directed graphs without sources and sinks, can be partially ordered via pp-constructability. We give a complete description of this poset and, in particular, we prove that it is a distributive lattice. Moreover, we show that in order to separate two smooth digraphs in our poset it suffices to show that the polymorphism clone of one of the digraphs satisfies a prime cyclic loop condition that is not satisfied by the polymorphism clone of the other.

1 Introduction

We consider a poset which is closely related to Constraint Satisfaction Problems (CSPs). In 1999 Feder and Vardi conjectured that the class of CSPs over finite structures admits a dichotomy, i.e., every such problem is either tractable or NP-complete. Recently Zhuk and Bulatov independently proved this conjecture [15, 7]. This dichotomy has an algebraic counterpart: the structures with NP-complete CSP are precisely those that pp-construct the graph $\Delta$, called $K_3$ (unless P = NP). It turns out that pp-constructability is a quasi-order on the class of all finite structures. Furthermore, there are even log-space reductions between the CSPs of comparable structures [3]. Hence, understanding the arising poset can lead to a better understanding of the precise computational complexity of CSPs within P.

This poset can be described in three different ways [3]. On the universal-algebraic side, pp-constructability can be characterized using minor-preserving maps between clones. A third way to describe this poset is a Birkhoff-like approach using powers of algebras and the new concept of reflections of algebras.

This article is a step at the beginning of the journey to understand the pp-constructability poset on all finite structures. This may be a ground of a finer classification of finite domain CSPs than the P/NP-complete dichotomy of Bulatov and Zhuk. A complete description of the subposet arising from two-element structures is given in [5].
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From [6], the subposet arising from undirected graphs is just a three-element chain: \([\Delta] < [\cdots] < [\cdot]\).

However, as for now studying the whole poset appears to be very difficult, since even seemingly simple cases, like for example directed graphs, are not well understood. In fact, in an early attempt to close in on the Feder-Vardi conjecture, researchers tried (hard) to classify which oriented trees have an NP-complete CSP, without success. However, it has been proved that the P/NP-complete dichotomy holds for a particular family of directed graphs, i.e., for every directed graph such that every vertex has an incoming and an outgoing edge [2]. Such digraphs are known in literature as smooth digraphs. From a result of Barto, Kozik, and Niven [2] it follows that every smooth digraph whose CSP is not NP-complete can be represented in the poset by a disjoint union of directed cycles.

In this article, we restrict our attention to finite smooth digraphs ordered by pp-constructability and give a comprehensible description of the corresponding poset. In particular, it turns out that this poset is even a distributive lattice and that it suffices to consider disjoint unions of directed cycles of prime lengths. It is known that for any two structures that do not pp-construct each other there is a height 1 (strong Mal’cev) condition that is satisfied by polymorphisms of one of the structures but not by polymorphisms of the other [3]. The present paper shows that for smooth digraphs this condition can be taken to be of a very special form, namely a prime cyclic loop condition (a loop condition corresponding to a disjoint union of cycles of prime length).

The main result of this article is the following:

**Theorem 1.1.** Let \(C\) be a finite disjoint union of cycles and \(A\) be a finite structure with finite relational signature. Then

\[ A \preceq C \ \text{iff} \ \text{Pol}(A) \vdash \Sigma \implies \text{Pol}(C) \vdash \Sigma \ \text{for all prime cyclic loop conditions} \ \Sigma. \]

Indeed, we are dealing with a special case of so-called loop conditions that have been studied recently [9, 12, 13]. There is hope that the present result can provide further insights into classifying all loop conditions.

**Notation**

- For \(n \in \mathbb{N}^+\), \([n] := \{1, \ldots, n\}\).
- By \(\text{Im}(f)\) we denote the image of \(f\).
- By \(\text{lcm}\) and \(\text{gcd}\) we denote the least common multiple and the greatest common divisor, respectively.
- For a tuple \(a = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)\) and a map \(\sigma: [m] \to [n]\), we denote the tuple \((a_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, a_{\sigma(m)})\) by \(a_{\sigma}\).
- By \(k \equiv_a \ell \) we denote \(k = \ell \ (\text{mod} \ a)\) and by \(+_a\) the addition modulo \(a\).
- By \(a \rightarrow^k b\) we denote that there is a path of length \(k\) from \(a\) to \(b\).
• By $A \to B$ we denote that there exists a homomorphism from $A$ to $B$.
• By $A \hookrightarrow B$ we denote that $A$ embeds into $B$.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we present formal definitions of some notions mentioned in the introduction.

2.1 The pp-constructability poset

Let $A = (A, (R_A^R)_{R \in \tau})$ and $B = (B, (R_B^R)_{R \in \tau})$ be structures with the same relational signature $\tau$. A map $h: A \to B$ is a homomorphism from $A$ to $B$ if it preserves all relations, i.e., for all $R \in \tau$:

\[
\text{if } (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in R_A^k, \text{ then } (h(a_1), \ldots, h(a_n)) \in R_B^k.
\]

We write $A \to B$ if there exists a homomorphism from $A$ to $B$.

**Definition 2.1.** Two structures $A$ and $B$ are homomorphically equivalent if $A \to B$ and vice versa $B \to A$.

Let $A$ be a relational structure and $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ be a primitive positive (pp-) formula, i.e., a first order formula using only existential quantification and conjunctions of atomic formulas. Then the relation

\[
\{(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \mid A \models \phi(a_1, \ldots, a_n)\}.
\]

is said to be pp-definable in $A$.

**Definition 2.2.** We say that $B$ is a pp-power of $A$ if it is isomorphic to a structure with domain $A^n$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, whose relations are pp-definable in $A$ (a $k$-ary relation on $A^n$ is regarded as a $kn$-ary relation on $A$).

Combining the notions introduced in definitions 2.1 and 2.2 we obtain the following definition from [3].

**Definition 2.3.** We say that $A$ pp-constructs $B$ (or $B$ is pp-constructable from $A$) if $B$ is homomorphically equivalent to a pp-power of $A$.

Since pp-constructability is a reflexive and transitive relation on the class of relational structures [3], it makes sense to consider the following quasi-order. Let $A$ and $B$ be relational structures:

\[
A \leq B \text{ if and only if } A \text{ pp-constructs } B.
\]

(1)

Note that the quasi-order defined in (1) naturally induces the equivalence relation

\[
A \equiv B \text{ if and only if } B \leq A \leq B.
\]
The equivalence classes induced by $\equiv$ are called \textit{pp-constructability types}. We name the set of all pp-constructability types of finite relational structures ordered by $\leq$ the \textit{pp-constructability poset} and denote it by $P_{\text{fin}}$. Observe that $[\hat{V}]$, the pp-constructability type of the loop-graph, is the top element of $P_{\text{fin}}$. Later we will see that there is also a bottom element and that it is $[\hat{K}_3]$, the pp-constructability type of the complete graph on 3 vertices $K_3$. In this diagram every undirected edge represents two directed edges.

\section{2.2 Height 1 identities}

As already mentioned, pp-constructability can be characterized algebraically; this characterization will provide the main tool to prove that a structure cannot pp-construct another structure. First, we define the basic notion of \textit{polymorphism}. Let $\text{Hom}(A, B) := \{f \mid f$ is a homomorphism from $A$ to $B\}$.

For $n \geq 1$, we denote by $A^n$ the structure with same signature $\tau$ as $A$, whose domain is $A^n$, such that for any $k$-ary $R \in \tau$, a tuple $(a_1, \ldots, a_k)$ of $n$-tuples is contained in $R^A$ if and only if it is contained in $R^A$ componentwise, i.e., $(a_{1j}, \ldots, a_{kj}) \in R^A$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$.

\begin{definition}
For a relational structure $A$, a \textit{polymorphism} of $A$ is an element of $\text{Hom}(A^n, A)$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Moreover, we denote by $\text{Pol}(A)$ the \textit{polymorphism clone} of $A$, i.e., the set of all polymorphisms of $A$. Throughout this article we treat all homomorphisms $f: A^I \to A$, where $I$ is a finite set, as elements of $\text{Pol}(A)$.

\begin{definition}
Let $\sigma: [m] \to [n]$ and $f: A^m \to A$ be functions. We denote by $f_\sigma: A^n \to A$ the function given by the rule $f_\sigma(a) := f(a_\sigma)$.

Any function of the form $f_\sigma$, for some map $\sigma: [m] \to [n]$, is called a \textit{minor} of $f$.

\begin{definition}
Let $A$ and $B$ be structures. An arity-preserving map $\lambda: \text{Pol}(B) \to \text{Pol}(A)$ is \textit{minor-preserving} if for all $f: B^m \to B$ in $\text{Pol}(B)$ and $\sigma: [m] \to [n]$ we have $\lambda(f_\sigma) = (\lambda f)_\sigma$.

We write $\text{Pol}(B) \xrightarrow{\text{minor}} \text{Pol}(A)$ to denote that there is a minor-preserving map from $\text{Pol}(B)$ to $\text{Pol}(A)$. The next theorem, restated from [3], shows that the concepts presented so far, pp-constructability and minor-preserving maps, give rise to the same poset.

\begin{theorem}[Theorem 1.3 in [3]]
Let $A$ and $B$ be finite structures. Then $B \preceq A$ if and only if $\text{Pol}(B) \xrightarrow{\text{minor}} \text{Pol}(A)$.
\end{theorem}
Definition 2.8. Let \( \sigma : [n] \to [r] \) and \( \tau : [m] \to [r] \) be functions. A height 1 identity is an expression of the form:

\[
\forall x_1, \ldots, x_r. f(x_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, x_{\sigma(n)}) \approx g(x_{\tau(1)}, \ldots, x_{\tau(m)}).
\]

In this case we write \( f(x_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, x_{\sigma(n)}) \approx g(x_{\tau(1)}, \ldots, x_{\tau(m)}) \) omitting the universal quantification, or even \( f \sigma \approx g \tau \) for brevity. A finite set of height 1 identities is called height 1 condition. A set of functions \( F \) satisfies a height 1 condition \( \Sigma \), denoted \( F \models \Sigma \), if there is a map \( \tilde{\cdot} \) assigning to each function symbol occurring in \( \Sigma \) a function in \( F \), such that for all \( f \sigma \approx g \tau \in \Sigma \) we have \( \tilde{f}_\sigma = \tilde{g}_\tau \). Note that we make a distinction between the symbol \( \approx \) and \( = \) to emphasize the difference between a formal identity involving function symbols and an equality of two specific functions.

Definition 2.9. Let \( \Sigma \) and \( \Gamma \) be height 1 conditions. We say that \( \Sigma \) implies \( \Gamma \) (equivalently, \( \Sigma \) is stronger then \( \Gamma \)) if, for any relational structure \( A \), \( \text{Pol}(A) \models \Sigma \) implies \( \text{Pol}(A) \models \Gamma \).

We say that a height 1 condition is trivial if it is satisfied by projections, or alternatively, if it is implied by any height 1 condition. Two height 1 conditions are equivalent if they imply each other. Observe that if \( \lambda : \text{Pol}(B) \to \text{Pol}(A) \) is minor-preserving and \( f \sigma = g \tau \), then \( \lambda(f) \sigma = \lambda(g) \tau \). It follows that minor-preserving maps preserve height 1 conditions. A simple compactness argument shows the following corollary.

Corollary 2.10. Let \( A \) and \( B \) be finite structures. Then

\[ B \leq A \text{ iff } \text{Pol}(B) \models \Sigma \text{ implies } \text{Pol}(A) \models \Sigma \text{ for all height 1 conditions } \Sigma. \]

We say that a height 1 condition \( \Sigma \) separates \( B \) from \( A \) if \( \text{Pol}(B) \not\models \Sigma \) but \( \text{Pol}(A) \not\models \Sigma \). In general, showing that there is no minor-preserving map from \( \text{Pol}(B) \) to \( \text{Pol}(A) \) is a rather complicated task. However, a recent result by Barto, Bulín, Krokhin and Opršal provides a concrete height 1 condition to check [1]. Nevertheless, we show that, for smooth digraphs, any separation can be proved by exhibiting a single height 1 identity with only one function symbol. Height 1 identities of this form have been studied in the literature and are known as loop conditions [12, 11].

Definition 2.11. Let \( \sigma, \tau : [m] \to [n] \) be maps. A loop condition is a height 1 identity of the form

\[ f \sigma \approx f \tau. \]

To any loop condition \( \Sigma \), given by an identity \( f \sigma \approx f \tau \), we can assign a directed graph in a natural way. Namely, we define the digraph \( G_\Sigma := ([n], \{(i, j) \mid i, j \in [m] \}) \).

Example 2.12. Some loop conditions \( \Sigma \) and the corresponding \( G_\Sigma \).

1. Let \( \Sigma \) be the loop condition \( f(x, y, x, z, y, z) \approx f(y, x, z, x, z, y) \). Then \( G_\Sigma \) is isomorphic to \( K_3 \).

2. Let \( \Sigma_3 \) be the loop condition \( f(x, y, z) \approx f(y, z, x) \). Then \( G_{\Sigma_3} \) is isomorphic to a directed cycle of length 3.
Observe that, for every digraph $G$, all loop conditions $\Sigma$ such that $G_\Sigma \cong G$ are equivalent. For convenience, we will from now on allow any finite set in the place of $[m]$ and $[n]$. This allows us to construct from the graph $G = (V, E)$ a concrete loop condition $\Sigma_G = (f_\sigma \approx f_\tau)$, where $\sigma, \tau : E \to V$ with $\sigma(u, v) = u$ and $\tau(u, v) = v$. Now $G_{\Sigma_G} = G$.

The name loop condition is justified by the following observation. If for some graph $G$, such that $\text{Pol}(G)$ satisfies $\Sigma$, we have $G_\Sigma \to G$, then $G$ has a loop. If $G_\Sigma$ itself has a loop, then there is an $i$ with $\sigma(i) = \tau(i)$ and a structure $\mathcal{A}$ satisfies $\Sigma$ with the projection $\pi_i : a \mapsto a_i$ and therefore $\Sigma$ is trivial.

If $G_\Sigma$ is a disjoint union of directed cycles, then we say that $\Sigma$ is a cyclic loop condition. For instance, the identity $\Sigma_3$ in Example 2.12 is a cyclic loop condition. For reasons that will be clarified later, it suffices to only consider cyclic loop conditions in this article.

2.3 Free structures

Here we present another characterization of pp-constructability. This section can be safely skipped without compromising the understanding of the rest of the paper; its aim is just to put our proof method for Lemma 4.21 into a larger context. The first instance of a free structure can be attributed to Feder and Vardi. They defined the power structure which can be considered as the first free structure in literature [8]. The definition of free structure which we are going to adopt in this article was first presented in [14], though the formal definition already appeared in [8].

**Definition 2.13.** Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a finite relational structure on the set $A = [n]$, and $\mathcal{C}$ a clone (not necessarily related to $\mathcal{A}$). The free structure of $\mathcal{C}$ generated by $\mathcal{A}$ is a relational structure $F_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A})$ with the same signature as $\mathcal{A}$. Its universe $F_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ consists of all $n$-ary functions of $\mathcal{C}$. For any relation of $\mathcal{A}$, say $R^A = \{r_1, \ldots, r_m\} \subseteq A^k$, the relation $R^F_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A})$ is defined as the set of all $k$-tuples $(f_1, \ldots, f_k) \in F_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ such that there exists an $m$-ary function $g \in \mathcal{C}$ that satisfies

$$f_j(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = g(r_{r_1j}, \ldots, r_{rmj}) \text{ for each } j = 1, \ldots, k.$$  

The following theorem links the notion of free structure to the characterization of pp-constructability presented in Theorem 2.7.

**Theorem 2.14** (Theorem 4.12 in [1]). Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be finite relational structures. Then

$$\mathcal{B} \leq \mathcal{A} \text{ if and only if } \text{Pol}(\mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{\text{minor}} \text{Pol}(\mathcal{A}) \text{ if and only if } F_{\text{Pol}(\mathcal{A})}(\mathcal{B}) \to \mathcal{B}.$$  

3 Smooth digraphs

A smooth digraph is a directed graph $G$ such that every vertex has an incoming and an outgoing edge. Let us denote the subposet of $\mathcal{P}_\text{fin}$ consisting of the pp-constructability types of finite smooth digraphs by $\mathcal{P}_{\text{SD}}$. Barto, Kozik, and Niven [2] showed the following dichotomy for smooth digraphs.
Theorem 3.1. Let $G$ be a finite smooth digraph. Then either $G$ pp-constructs $K_3$ or it is homomorphically equivalent to a finite disjoint union of directed cycles.

It is known that $K_3$ pp-constructs every finite structure (see, e.g., [4]). Hence, $[K_3]$ is the bottom element of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}$ and also of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{SD}}$. From the previous theorem we know that every non-minimal element in $\mathcal{P}_{\text{SD}}$ contains a finite disjoint union of finite directed cycles. As we are always considering digraphs, we will usually drop the word directed.

On the remaining pages we will provide a classification of the pp-constructability order on disjoint unions of cycles.

3.1 Directed cycles

To any finite set $C \subset \mathbb{N}^+$ we associate a finite disjoint union of cycles $C = (V, E)$ defined by

$$V := \{(a, k) \mid a \in C, k \in \mathbb{Z}_a\} \quad \text{and} \quad E := \{((a, k), (a, k + a_1)) \mid a \in C, k \in \mathbb{Z}_a\}.$$ 

For the sake of notation we will from now on write $+$ instead of $\mathbb{Z}_a$; it will be clear from the context to which addition we are referring to. For any $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ we write $C_{a_1, \ldots, a_n}$ for the finite disjoint union of cycles associated to the set $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$. Note that $C_a$ is a directed cycle of length $a$. Conversely, to any finite disjoint union of cycles $C$ we associate the set $C := \{a \mid C_a \hookrightarrow C\}$, where by $C_a \hookrightarrow C$ we denote that $C_a$ embeds into $C$.

We warn the reader that previously $C$ denoted the underlying set of the structure $C$, but from now on $C$ itself will denote the structure as well as the underlying set and $C$ is the set defined above. We hope that this will not lead to any confusion. Also beware that the finite disjoint union of cycles $D$ associated to the set associated to a finite disjoint union of cycles $C$ is not necessarily isomorphic to $C$. The structure $C$ could have multiple copies of the same cycle whereas $D$ may not. However, $C$ and $D$ are homomorphically equivalent and thus represent the same element in $\mathcal{P}_{\text{SD}}$.

For a disjoint union of cycles $C$, $a, b \in C$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ we write $a \overset{k}{\rightarrow} b$ if there is a path of length $k$ from $a$ to $b$. Note that, for fixed $a$ and $k$ there is exactly one such $b$, we denote it by $a + k$. We define $\sigma_C \in \text{Aut}(C)$ as

$$\sigma_C(a) := a + 1.$$ 

Observe that the cyclic loop condition $\Sigma_C$, introduced in Section 2.2 is $f \approx f_{\sigma_C}$. If $C$ is the finite disjoint union of cycles associated to the set $C$, then we write $\sigma_C$ and $\Sigma_C$ instead of $\sigma_C$ and $\Sigma_C$, respectively. Note that $\sigma_C(a, k) = (a, k + 1)$.

We want to remark that, any finite power $C^n$ of a disjoint union of cycles $C$ is again a disjoint union of cycles. Hence, for an element $a \in C^n$, $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we have that $a + k$ is already defined, furthermore

$$a + k = (a_1 + k, \ldots, a_n + k).$$

For $a, c \in \mathbb{N}^+$ define $a \div c := \frac{a}{\text{gcd}(a, c)}$. Note that $a \div c$ is always a natural number. The choice of the symbol $\div$ is meant to emphasize that $a \div c$ is the numerator of the
fraction \( a \div c \) in reduced form. Roughly speaking, the operation \( \div \) should be understood as “divide as much as you can”. The operation \( \div \) has the following useful properties.

**Lemma 3.2.** For all \( a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}^+ \) we have

1. \( a \div (a \div c) = \gcd(a, c) \),
2. \( (a \div b) \div c = a \div (b \cdot c) \),
3. \( \gcd(a \div c, c \div a) = 1 \), and
4. \( a \div c = 1 \) if and only if \( a \) divides \( c \).

**Proof.** Simply applying the definitions we obtain:

\[
a \div (a \div c) = \frac{a}{\gcd(a, a \div c)} = \frac{a}{\gcd(a, \frac{a}{\gcd(a, c)})} = \frac{a}{\gcd(a, c)} = \gcd(a, c)
\]

The reader can verify the other statements. \( \square \)

For a finite disjoint union of cycles \( C \) and \( c \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), we let \( C \div c \) denote the finite disjoint union of cycles associated to the set \( C \div c := \{ a \div c \mid a \in C \} \).

# 4 Description of \( \mathfrak{P}_{\text{SD}} \)

Here we present the outline of this article. We remind the reader that we are interested in describing \( \mathfrak{P}_{\text{SD}} \), namely the subposet of \( \mathfrak{P}_{\text{fin}} \) containing the pp-constructability types of smooth digraphs. Whenever you feel lost come back to this paragraph and Figure 1. Firstly, in Lemma 4.4 we show that whether a disjoint union of cycles satisfies a cyclic loop condition can be tested via purely number theoretic means. Secondly, we show that cyclic loop conditions also suffice to describe \( \mathfrak{P}_{\text{SD}} \). This is formally stated in Lemma 4.11. With some more effort, we show in Theorem 4.19 that even very specific cyclic loop conditions suffice, i.e., cyclic loop conditions where every cycle is of prime length. This allows us to give a simple description of the elements of \( \mathfrak{P}_{\text{SD}} \) as downsets of some poset; in particular, we show that \( \mathfrak{P}_{\text{SD}} \) is a distributive lattice.

## 4.1 Cyclic loop conditions

To get a better understanding of the structures we are working with, we reproduce a well-known fact about cycles.

**Example 4.1.** Consider the digraph \( C_3 \). Observe that \( \text{Pol}(C_3) \models \Sigma_2 \) as witnessed by the polymorphism

\[ f(x, y) = 2 \cdot (x + y) \pmod{3}. \]
On the other hand, \( \text{Pol}(\mathbb{C}_3) \not\models \Sigma_3 \). Assume that \( f \) is a polymorphism of \( \mathbb{C}_3 \) satisfying \( \Sigma_3 \), then

\[
\begin{align*}
f((3,0),(3,1),(3,2)) &= a \\
\downarrow & \\
f((3,1),(3,2),(3,0)) &= a
\end{align*}
\]

and \((a,a)\) is a loop, a contradiction.

**Lemma 4.2.** Let \( p,q \) be primes, then \( \text{Pol}(\mathbb{C}_p) \) satisfies \( \Sigma_q \) if and only if \( p \neq q \).

**Proof.** If \( p \neq q \), then there is a \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \) such that \( q \cdot n \equiv_p 1 \). The map

\[
f(x_1,\ldots,x_q) = n \cdot (x_1 + \ldots + x_q) \quad \text{(mod } p)\]

is a polymorphism of \( \mathbb{C}_p \) satisfying \( \Sigma_q \).

Assume that \( f \) is a polymorphism of \( \mathbb{C}_p \) satisfying \( \Sigma_p \), then

\[
f((p,0),\ldots,(p,p-2),(p,p-1)) = a = f((p,1),\ldots,(p,p-1),(p,0))
\]
and \((a, a)\) is a loop, a contradiction.

From Corollary \ref{corollary:antichain} it is easy to see that the digraphs \(C_2, C_3, C_5, \ldots\) form an infinite antichain in \(\mathcal{P}_{SD}\). In Lemma \ref{lemma:generalize} we generalize Lemma \ref{lemma:finite} to disjoint union of cycles. First, we present an example to better understand the polymorphisms of disjoint unions of cycles.

**Example 4.3.** Let us examine the binary polymorphisms of \(C_{2,3}\). We write \(C_{2,3}^2\) as \(\tilde{C}_2 \cup \tilde{C}_2 \cup \tilde{C}_3 \cup \tilde{C}_3 \cup \tilde{C}_6 \cup \tilde{C}_6\). Every element in \(\text{Hom}(C_{2,3}^2, C_{2,3})\) is build from homomorphisms of the connected components into \(C_{2,3}\). Formally,

\[
\text{Hom}(C_{2,3}^2, C_{2,3}) = \text{Hom}(\tilde{C}_2, C_{2,3}) \cup \text{Hom}(\tilde{C}_2, C_{2,3}) \\
\cup \text{Hom}(\tilde{C}_3, C_{2,3}) \cup \text{Hom}(\tilde{C}_3, C_{2,3}) \cup \text{Hom}(\tilde{C}_6, C_{2,3}) \\
\cup \text{Hom}(\tilde{C}_6, C_{2,3}) \cup \text{Hom}(\tilde{C}_6, C_{2,3})
\]

where

\[(f_1 \cup \cdots \cup f_7)(a) = f_i(a) \text{ if } a \in \text{Dom}(f_i).
\]

Hence, \(|\text{Hom}(C_{2,3}^2, C_{2,3})| = 2^2 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5^2.\)

The following lemma characterizes when a finite disjoint union of cycles satisfies a cyclic loop condition.

**Lemma 4.4.** Let \(C\) be a finite disjoint union of cycles and \(D \subseteq \mathbb{N}^+\) finite. We have \(\text{Pol}(C) \equiv \Sigma_D\) if and only if for all maps \(h: D \to C\) there is a \(a \in C\) such that

\[a \text{ divides } \text{lcm}((h(b) - b)_{b \in D}).\]

**Proof.** Assume without loss of generality that \(C\) is the finite disjoint union of cycles associated to the set \(C \subseteq \mathbb{N}^+\).

\((\Rightarrow)\) Consider a map \(h: D \to C\) and a polymorphism \(f: C^D \to C\) of \(C\) satisfying \(\Sigma_D\). Define

\[c := \text{lcm}((h(b) - b)_{b \in D})\]

and the tuple \(t \in C^D\) as \(t_{(b,k)} := (h(b), c \cdot k)\) for \(b \in D\) and \(k \in \mathbb{Z}_b\). Now we want to show that \(f(t) = f(t + c)\). Observe that \((t_{x_0})_{(b,k)} = t_{x_0(b,k)} = t_{(b,k+1)}\) for all \(b \in D\) and
For every $b$ we have, by definition of $c$, that $h(b)$ divides $c \cdot b$. Hence, $c \cdot b \equiv h(b) \pmod{0}$ for all $b$ and
\[
t_{(b,0)} = (h(b), 0) = (h(b), c \cdot b) = (h(b), c \cdot (b - 1) + c) = t_{(b,b-1)} + c.
\]
Therefore $t_{\sigma_D} = t + c$, which just says that $t$ maps neighbouring points in $\mathbb{D}$ to points in $\mathbb{C}$ that are connected with a path of length $c$. Furthermore, we have
\[
f(t) = f_{\sigma_D}(t) = f(t_{\sigma_D}) = f(t + c).
\]
Since $t \mapsto (t + c)$ and $f$ is a polymorphism we have that $f(t)$ is in a cycle whose length divides $c$.

$(\Leftarrow)$ For this direction we construct a polymorphism $f: \mathbb{C}^D \to \mathbb{C}$ of $\mathbb{C}$ satisfying $\Sigma_D$.
Let $G$ be the subgroup of the symmetric group on $\mathbb{C}^D$ generated by $\sigma_D: t \mapsto t_{\sigma_D}$ and $+1: t \mapsto (t + 1)$. Recall that $(t_{\sigma_D})(b,k) = t_{(b,k+1)}$ and $((+1)(t))(b,k) = t_{(b,k)} + 1$. Hence, $\sigma_D \circ (+1) = (+1) \circ \sigma_D$, $G$ is commutative, and every element of $G$ is of the form $\sigma_D^c \circ (+1)^d$ for some $c$ and $d$. For every orbit of $\mathbb{C}^D$ under $G$ pick a representative and denote the set of representatives by $T$. Let $t \in T$ and define the map $h: D \to C$ such that for every $b$ there is a $k$ with $t_{(b,0)} = (h(b), k)$. By assumption there is an $a_t \in C$ such that
\[
a_t \text{ divides } \text{lcm}((h(b) - b)_{b \in D}).
\]
Define $f$ on the orbit of $t$ as
\[
f((\sigma_D^c \circ (+1)^d)(t)) = f((t + d)_{\sigma_D}) := (a_t, d) \text{ for all } c, d.
\]

To show that $f$ is well defined on the orbit of $t$ it suffices to prove that $(t + d)_{\sigma_D} = (t + \ell)_{\sigma_D}$ implies $d \equiv a_t \ell$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $m = \ell = 0$. Fix some $b \in D$, we want to show that $(h(b) - b)$ divides $d$. Observe that $(t + d)_{\sigma_D} = t$ implies
\[
t_{(b,(k+1)-c)} + d = t_{(b,k,c)} \text{ for all } k.
\]
Considering that $(b - c) \cdot c \equiv b \pmod{0}$ we have $t_{(b,0)} + (b - c) \cdot d = t_{(b,0)}$ and $(b - c) \cdot d \equiv h(b) \pmod{0}$. Therefore $h(b) - (b - c)$ divides $d$ and also $h(b) - b$ divides $d$. Since this holds for all $b \in D$ we have, by $(\ref{2})$, that $a_t$ divides $d$ as desired.

Repeating this for every $t \in T$ defines $f$ on $\mathbb{C}^D$. The function $f$ is well defined since the orbits partition $\mathbb{C}^D$. If $r \mapsto s$, then $s = (r + 1) = (+1)(r)$ and $f(r) \mapsto f(s)$, so $f$ is a polymorphism. Furthermore $f = f_{\sigma_D}$ by definition.

**Example 4.5.** Consider the structure $\mathbb{C}_{5,6}$ and the cyclic loop condition $\Sigma_{2,5}$. Note that, for the map $h(2) = 6$, $h(5) = 5$, neither 5 nor 6 divides 3 = lcm($h(2) - 2, h(5) - 5$).
Hence, by Lemma $4.4$, $\mathbb{C}_{5,6} \not\models \Sigma_{2,5}$. The tuple constructed in the proof is
\[
t = ((6,0), (6,3), (5,0), (5,3), (5,1), (5,4), (5,2)).
\]
Since $t + 3 = t_{\sigma_D}$ any $f \in \text{Pol}(\mathbb{C}_{5,6})$ that would satisfy $\Sigma_{2,5}$ would also have to map $t$ to an element of $\mathbb{C}_{5,6}$ that lies in a cycle whose length divides 3. Hence, such an $f$ does not exist.
As a consequence of Lemma 4.4 we obtain the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.6.** Let \( C \) be a finite disjoint union of cycles and \( c \in \mathbb{N}^+ \). Then

\[
\text{Pol}(C) \models \Sigma_{C \vdash c} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad 1 \in (C \vdash c).
\]

**Proof.** The \( \iff \) direction is clear. If \( 1 \in (C \vdash c) \), then \( \Sigma_{C \vdash c} \) is trivial since it is satisfied by the projection \( \pi: C^{C \vdash c} \to C \), \( t \mapsto t_{(1,0)} \).

For the \( \Rightarrow \) direction let \( h: (C \vdash c) \to C \) be some map with \( h(b) \vdash c = b \). For instance, \( h(b) = \min\{a \in C \mid a \vdash c = b\} \). We apply Lemma 4.4 to \( h \) and obtain some \( C_a \vdash C \) such that \( a \) divides

\[
\text{lcm}((h(b) \vdash c)_{b\in(C \vdash c)}) = \text{lcm}((d - (d \vdash c))_{d\in\text{Im}(h)}) = \text{lcm}((\text{gcd}(d,c))_{d\in\text{Im}(h)})
\]

which divides \( c \). Therefore, \( a \vdash c = 1 \in (C \vdash c) \). \( \square \)

Before proving the connection between pp-constructability and cyclic loop conditions in Lemma 4.1 we have one more lemma. As presented here Lemma 4.7 is quite technical, however using height 1 conditions of the form \( \Sigma(A_1, A_2) \) introduced in \( \llbracket \), it can be rephrased in a nicer way. The notation \( \Sigma(A_1, A_2) \) generalizes loop conditions in the following sense: if for some structure \( B \), such that \( \text{Pol}(B) \) satisfies \( \Sigma(A_1, A_2) \), we have \( A_1 \to B \), then \( A_2 \to B \). The loop condition \( \Sigma_B \) is equivalent to \( \Sigma(G, \tilde{q}) \). For a formal definition we refer the reader to \( \llbracket \text{Section 3.2} \rrbracket \). The loop condition \( f = f_{\sigma_C} \) used in Lemma 4.7 is equivalent to \( \Sigma(C, C_c) \). Hence, the lemma proves that \( \Sigma(C, C_c) \) is stronger than \( \Sigma(C \vdash c, \tilde{q}) \), in fact they are even equivalent.

**Lemma 4.7.** Let \( B \) be any structure, \( C \subset \mathbb{N}^+ \) finite, \( c \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), and \( f \in \text{Pol}(B) \). If \( f = f_{\sigma_C} \), then \( \text{Pol}(B) \models \Sigma_{C \vdash c} \).

**Proof.** Let \( f: B^C \to B \) be a polymorphism of \( B \) with \( f = f_{\sigma_C} \). By Lemma 3.2 we have that \( \text{gcd}(a \vdash c, c \vdash a) = 1 \). Hence, \( \frac{1}{c-a} \text{ mod } (a \vdash c) \) is well defined. Consider the wonderful map

\[
\tau: C \to C \vdash c, \quad (a, k) \mapsto \left(a \vdash c, \frac{k}{\text{gcd}(a,c)} \cdot 1 \vdash a\right).
\]

To better understand \( \tau \) we recommend testing its definition on \( C = C_{10} \) and \( c = 6 \). Observe that for every \( a \) and \( k \), since \( \frac{k}{\text{gcd}(a,c)} = c \vdash a \) is a natural number, we have

\[
\tau(a, k + c) = \left(a \vdash c, \frac{k + c}{\text{gcd}(a,c)} \cdot 1 \vdash a\right) = \left(a \vdash c, \frac{k}{\text{gcd}(a,c)} \cdot 1 \vdash a + 1\right) = \tau(a, k) + 1.
\]

Hence, \( \tau \circ \sigma_C = \sigma_{C \vdash c} \circ \tau \) and the polymorphism \( f_{\tau}: B^{C \vdash c} \to B \) satisfies for all \( t \in B^{C \vdash c} \)

\[
f_{\tau}(t) = f_{\sigma_C}((t_{\tau})) = f(t_{\tau \circ \sigma_C}) = f(t_{\sigma_{C \vdash c} \circ \tau}) = f_{\tau}(t_{\sigma_{C \vdash c}}).
\]

Therefore \( f_{\tau} \) witnesses \( \text{Pol}(B) \models \Sigma_{C \vdash c} \). \( \square \)
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Now we have all the necessary ingredients to prove the connection between cyclic loop conditions and pp-constructions in $\mathcal{P}_{SD}$ stated in Lemma 4.11. In particular, we show that cyclic loop conditions suffice to separate disjoint unions of cycles. We suggest to look at the following concrete pp-constructions first.

**Example 4.8.** The structure $C_6$ pp-constructs $C_3$. We consider the first pp-power of $C_6$ given by the pp-formula:

$$\Phi_E(x, z) \equiv \exists y. E(x, y) \land E(y, z).$$

We obtain a structure that consists of two disjoint copies of $C_3$. This structure is homomorphically equivalent to $C_3$, see Figure 3. Note that one can express with a pp-formula that there is a path of length $k$ from $x$ to $y$. We denote this formula by $x \rightarrow^k y$.

Using this notation, $C_6$ pp-constructs $C_3$ with the formula $\Phi_E(x, y) \equiv x \rightarrow^2 y$ and $C_2$ with the formula $\Phi_E(x, y) \equiv x \rightarrow^3 y$.

**Example 4.9.** The digraph $C_{2,3}$ pp-constructs $C_6$. Consider the second pp-power of $C_{2,3}$ given by the pp-formula:

$$\Phi_E(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) \equiv (x_1 \rightarrow^1 y_1) \land (x_2 \rightarrow^1 y_2) \land (x_1 \rightarrow^2 x_1) \land (x_2 \rightarrow^3 x_2).$$

The resulting structure, that consists of one copy of $C_6$ and 19 isolated points, is homomorphically equivalent to $C_6$, and therefore $C_{2,3} \leq C_6$.

**Example 4.10.** The digraph $C_3$ pp-constructs $C_9$. Consider the third pp-power of $C_3$ given by the formula:

$$\Phi_E(x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3) \equiv (x_2 \approx y_1) \land (x_3 \approx y_2) \land (x_1 \rightarrow^1 y_3). \quad (*)$$

Let us denote the resulting structure by $C$. There is an edge $s \rightarrow t$ in $C$ if the tuple $t$ is obtained from $s$ by first increasing the first entry and then shifting all entries cyclically, see Figure 4. With this it is clear that for every element $t$ in $C$ we have $t \rightarrow^9 t$. It turns out that $C$ consists of three copies of $C_9$, hence $C_3 \leq C_9$ and even $C_3 \equiv C_9$.

Note that, the pp-formula $(*)$ applied to $C_2$ does not directly give $C_6$; instead, it yields a structure isomorphic to $C_{2,6}$, which is homomorphically equivalent to $C_2$.

Although it is neither clear nor necessary we would like to mention that the pp-construction in the proof of the following lemma is essentially just a combination of the three constructions we saw in the examples 4.8, 4.9, and 4.10.
\[ s = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \\ c \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\text{increase}} \begin{pmatrix} a + 1 \\ b \\ c \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\text{shift}} \begin{pmatrix} b \\ c \\ a + 1 \end{pmatrix} = t \]

Figure 4: The shape of tuples \( s \) and \( t \) in the edge-relation defined by the pp-formula \((*)\).

**Lemma 4.11.** Let \( C \) be a finite disjoint union of cycles and \( B \) be a finite structure with finite relational signature \( \tau \). Then

\[ B \preceq C \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{Pol}(B) \not\models \Sigma_{C \hookrightarrow C} \text{ implies } \text{Pol}(C) \not\models \Sigma_{C \hookrightarrow C} \text{ for all } c \text{ that divide } \text{lcm}(C). \]

We remark that the first part of the following proof is a specific instance of the proof of (1) \( \Rightarrow \) (3) in Theorem 2.14. As the reader might not be very familiar with free structures, we present a self contained proof.

**Proof.** We show both directions separately.

\((\Rightarrow)\) Since \( \Sigma_{C \hookrightarrow C} \) is a height 1 condition, this direction follows from Corollary 2.10.

\((\Leftarrow)\) Assume without loss of generality that \( C \) is the structure associated to \( C \). Let \( F \) be the \( \lfloor B \rfloor \cdot k \)-th pp-power of \( B \) defined by the formula

\[ \Phi_E(x, y) := \bigwedge \{ x_t \equiv y_t \land \Phi_R(x) \mid t \in B^C, R \in \tau \}, \]

where for every \( k \)-ary \( R \in \tau \) we have

\[ \Phi_R(x) := \bigwedge \{ R(x_{t_1}, \ldots, x_{t_k}) \mid t_1, \ldots, t_k \in B^C \text{ with } (t_{1a}, \ldots, t_{ka}) \in R^B \text{ for all } a \in C \}. \]

We can think of the elements of \( F \) as maps from \( B^C \) to \( B \). The formula \( \Phi_R(f) \) holds if and only if \( f \) preserves \( R^B \). Note that \( f \) preserves \( R^B \) if and only if \( f_{\sigma_C} \) preserves \( R^B \). Hence \( \Phi_E \) ensures that all elements of \( F \) that are not polymorphisms of \( B \) are isolated points. On the other hand polymorphisms \( f \) of \( B \) that are in \( F \) have exactly one in-neighbour, namely \( f_{\sigma_C} \), and one out-neighbour, namely \( f_{\sigma_C} \). Hence, \( F \) is homomorphically equivalent to a disjoint union of cycles, i.e., the structure \( F \) without isolated points. Furthermore, all cycles in \( F \) are of the form \( f \xrightarrow{1} f_{\sigma_C} \xrightarrow{1} f_{\sigma_C^2} \xrightarrow{1} \cdots \xrightarrow{1} f_{\sigma_C^k} = f \) for some \( k \in \mathbb{N} \).

We show that \( F \) and \( C \) are homomorphically equivalent by proving the following two statements:

1. \( C_a \hookrightarrow C \) implies \( C_a \hookrightarrow F \) and
2. \( C_c \hookrightarrow F \) implies \( C_c \hookrightarrow C \).

First statement: Let \( C_a \hookrightarrow C \). Then the polymorphism \( \pi_{(a,0)} : B^C \rightarrow B \), \( t \mapsto t_{(a,0)} \) generates the following cycle of length \( a \) in \( F \):

\[ \pi_{(a,0)} \rightarrow \pi_{(a,1)} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \pi_{(a,a-1)} \rightarrow \pi_{(a,0)}. \]
Second statement: Let \( C \hookrightarrow F \) and let \( f \) be a polymorphism in a cycle of length \( c \) in \( F \). Then \( f = f_{cC} \). By Lemma 4.7, \( \text{Pol}(B) \models \Sigma_{C \cdot c} \) and, by assumption, \( \text{Pol}(C) \models \Sigma_{C \cdot c} \) as well. Applying Lemma 4.6 we conclude that \( 1 \in (C \cdot c) \). Hence, there is some \( C, a \hookrightarrow C \) such that \( a \) divides \( c \).

It follows that \( F \) and \( C \) are homomorphically equivalent. Hence, \( C \) is pp-constructable from \( B \).

The construction in the proof was discovered by Opršal (see [1] or [14] for more details). We thank him for explaining it to us. Note that, following the notation introduced in Definition 2.13, the structure \( F \), after removing all isolated points, is \( \text{Pol}(B) \cdot C \).

**Example 4.12.** Let \( C = \{6, 20, 15\} \). By Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 4.11, to test whether a structure \( B \) is below \( C \) we only have to check whether \( B \) does not satisfy any of the cyclic loop conditions \( \Sigma_{6,20,15}, \Sigma_{2,20,5}, \Sigma_{3,10,15}, \Sigma_{6,4,3}, \Sigma_{3,5,15}, \Sigma_{3,2,3} \), which are the nontrivial ones of the form \( \Sigma_{C \cdot c} \).

We show that the disjoint union of cycles \( C_{2,3,5} \) is below \( C \). First we check that \( C_{2,3,5} / \models \Sigma_{2,20,15} \). Consider the map \( h(6) = 2, h(20) = 2, h(15) = 3 \). We have

\[
\text{lcm}(2 \cdot 6, 2 \cdot 20, 3 \cdot 15) = 1.
\]

Clearly, neither 2 nor 3 nor 5 divide 1. Hence, by Lemma 4.4, \( C_{2,3,5} \not\models \Sigma_{6,20,15} \). Similarly, \( C_{2,3,5} \) does not satisfy the other five loop conditions. On the other hand, the structure \( C_{2,15} \) is not below \( C \) since it satisfies \( \Sigma_{3,5,15} \).

### 4.2 Prime cyclic loop conditions

In this section we show that we can further reduce the number of cyclic loop conditions that we have to look at. For this we use the following general result on loop conditions.

**Theorem 4.13** (Corollary 1 in [12]). Let \( \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \) be loop conditions. If there is a digraph homomorphism \( G_{\Sigma_1} \to G_{\Sigma_2} \), then every structure satisfying \( \Sigma_1 \) satisfies \( \Sigma_2 \) as well.

We can use Theorem 4.13 to easily deduce implications between cyclic loop conditions. However, for convenience, we state some results explicitly.

**Lemma 4.14.** Let \( B \) be any structure, \( C \subset N^+ \) finite, and \( a, c \in N^+ \).

1. If \( \text{Pol}(B) \models \Sigma_C \), then \( \text{Pol}(B) \models \Sigma_{C \cdot c} \) and \( \text{Pol}(B) \not\models \Sigma_{C \cdot a} \).

2. If \( a \) is a multiple of an element of \( C \), then \( \text{Pol}(B) \models \Sigma_{C \cdot a} \) if and only if \( \text{Pol}(B) \not\models \Sigma_{C} \).

**Corollary 4.15.** Let \( B \) be any structure, \( C \subset N^+ \) finite, and \( c, d \in N^+ \). If \( \text{Pol}(B) \not\models \Sigma_{C \cdot (c-d)} \), then \( \text{Pol}(B) \not\models \Sigma_{C \cdot c} \).

We can use this condition when we order cyclic loop conditions of the form \( \Sigma_{C \cdot c} \) by strength.
Definition 4.16. Let $C$ be a finite disjoint union of cycles and $c \in \mathbb{N}^+$. The cyclic loop condition $\Sigma_{C \sim c}$ is minimal for $C$, if $\Sigma_{C \sim c}$ is minimal among all non trivial cyclic loop conditions of the form $\Sigma_{C \sim d}$ ordered by strength.

Observe that, if $\Sigma_{C \sim c}$ is minimal for $C$, then $c$ is maximal in the sense that $1 \notin (C \sim c)$ and $1 \in C \sim (c \cdot d)$ for all $d > 1$ dividing $\text{lcm}(C \sim c)$. In Lemma 4.11 by Corollary 4.15 it suffices to consider only $\Sigma_{C \sim c}$ that are minimal for $C$.

For instance, in Example 4.12 it therefore suffices to consider the three cyclic loop conditions that are minimal for $C_{6,20,15}$, highlighted in Figure 5. By Lemma 4.14, a structure satisfies $\Sigma_{2,20,5}$ if and only if it satisfies $\Sigma_{2,5}$. Observe that also the other two minimal cyclic loop conditions are equivalent to cyclic loop conditions where only prime numbers occur. In Lemma 4.18 we show that this observation holds in general. As cyclic loop conditions where only prime numbers occur are central to our main result, we name them.

Definition 4.17. A cyclic loop condition of the form $\Sigma_P$ is called a prime cyclic loop condition if all elements of $P$ are prime numbers.

Lemma 4.18. Let $C$ be a finite disjoint union of cycles and $c \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that $\Sigma_{C \sim c}$ is minimal for $C$. Then $\Sigma_{C \sim c}$ is equivalent to a prime cyclic loop condition.

Proof. We show that $\Sigma_{C \sim c}$ is, after removing multiples (which yields an equivalent loop condition), a prime cyclic loop condition. Let $a$ be in $(C \sim c)$ and $p$ be a prime divisor of $a$ (which exists since $a \neq 1$). Since $\Sigma_{C \sim c}$ is minimal for $C$ we have $1 \notin (C \sim c)$ and $1 \in (C \sim (c \cdot p))$. Hence $p \in (C \sim c)$ and $a$ is a multiple of a prime in $(C \sim c)$, as desired. $\square$

Using the previous lemma we show that prime cyclic loop conditions suffice to determine the order on $\mathcal{P}_{SD}$.

Theorem 4.19. Let $C$ be a finite disjoint union of cycles and $\mathcal{B}$ be a finite structure with finite relational signature. Then

$$\mathcal{B} \preceq C \iff \text{Pol}(\mathcal{B}) \models \Sigma \text{ implies Pol}(C) \models \Sigma \text{ for all prime cyclic loop conditions } \Sigma.$$  

Proof. By Lemma 4.11 and Corollary 4.15 $\mathcal{B} \preceq C$ if and only if Pol$(\mathcal{B}) \models \Sigma_{C \sim c}$ implies Pol$(C) \models \Sigma_{C \sim c}$ for all $\Sigma_{C \sim c}$ that are minimal for $C$. By Lemma 4.18 all $\Sigma_{C \sim c}$ that are minimal for $C$ are equivalent to prime cyclic loop conditions. $\square$
In Example 4.12 the prime cyclic loop conditions to be considered are presented in Figure 5. A priori it could be that among the prime cyclic loop conditions that are not satisfied by $C$ there is one that is minimal and is not equivalent to a cyclic loop condition of the form $\Sigma_{C\div c}$ for any $c$. Now we show that this is never the case.

**Lemma 4.20.** Let $C$ be a finite disjoint union of cycles and $\Sigma_P$ be a prime cyclic loop condition. Then $Pol(C) \not\models \Sigma_P$ iff there is an $a \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that $1 \notin (C\div c)$ and $P \subseteq (C\div c)$.

**Proof.** The proof is straightforward.

$(\Leftarrow)$ Lemma 4.6 implies $Pol(C) \not\models \Sigma_C\div c$. Since $P \subseteq (C\div c)$ we have, by Lemma 4.14, that $C$ also does not satisfy $\Sigma_P$.

$(\Rightarrow)$ Since $Pol(C) \not\models \Sigma_P$, by Lemma 4.3 there is a map $h: P \to C$ such that no $a \in C$ divides $c$, where $c := \text{lcm}((h(p) - p)_{p \in P})$. Note that if $a - c = 1$, then $\gcd(a, c) = a$ and $a$ divides $c$. Hence, we have $1 \notin (C\div c)$. Furthermore $h(p) - c = p$ for all $p$ and therefore $P \subseteq (C\div c)$.}

In order to determine the place of any smooth digraph $G$, such that $[G] \neq [K_3]$, in $\mathcal{P}_{SD}$ it suffices to know which prime cyclic loop conditions are satisfied in $Pol(G)$. Note that $Pol(G)$ satisfies infinitely many prime cyclic loop conditions; on the other hand, only finitely many prime cyclic loop conditions are not satisfied in $Pol(G)$. Since in the following setting it is easier to handle finite sets, we define for any structure $A$ the following:

$$PL(A) := \{P \mid P \text{ is a finite nonempty set of primes and } Pol(A) \not\models \Sigma_P\}.$$  

Let $FP$ be the set of all finite nonempty sets of primes. We order the set $FP$ via inclusion and denote the set of all finite downsets by $\downarrow (FP)$.

Now we are ready to present the classification.

**Theorem 4.21.** The map

$$\mathcal{P}_{SD} \rightarrow \downarrow (FP) \cup \{FP\},$$

$[G] \mapsto PL(G)$

is an isomorphism of posets where the order on the image set is reverse inclusion.

To better understand what this map does, have a look at the illustration in Figure 6.

**Proof.** First note that, for any smooth digraph $G$, we have that $PL(G)$ is infinite if and only if $[G] \neq [K_3]$, in which case $PL(G) = FP$. Hence only the bottom element $[K_3]$ of $\mathcal{P}_{SD}$ is mapped to the bottom element $FP$. Together with Theorem 4.19 we get that the map is well-defined and is an injective homomorphism.

Next we show surjectivity. Since $[K_3]$ maps to $FP$, what is left to be considered are the finite downsets. Let $S$ be a finite downset of $FP$ and let $P$ denote the set of primes occurring in $S$. Define $S_{\text{max}}$ as the set of maximal elements of $S$ with respect to inclusion and

$$C := \{\text{lcm}((p_T)_{T \in S_{\text{max}}}) \mid (p_T)_{T \in S_{\text{max}}} \in \mathbb{N}^{S_{\text{max}}} \text{ with } p_T \in T \text{ for every } T \in S_{\text{max}}\}.$$
We prove $\text{PL}(\mathbb{C}) = S$.

(2) Let $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, since $\text{PL}(\mathbb{C})$ is closed under downsets we can assume $S$ to be maximal, define $c_S := \prod (P \setminus S)$. We want to apply Lemma 4.20 to show $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{C}) \nsubseteq S$. Firstly, note that, since $S \subseteq S_{\text{max}}$, any $a \in C$ is a multiple of a prime $p \in S$. Also $p$ does not divide $c_S$, hence $a \div c_S \neq 1$ and $1 \notin (C \setminus c_S)$. Secondly, let $p \in S$. Since $S$ is maximal we have that for every other $T \subseteq S_{\text{max}}$ there exists a $p_T \in T \setminus S$. Define $p_S := p$ and $a := \text{lcm}((p_T)_{T \subseteq S_{\text{max}}})$. Then $a \in C$ and $a \div c_S = p$. Therefore $p \in (C \setminus c_S)$. Hence, $S \subseteq (C \setminus c_S)$ and, by Lemma 4.20, $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{C}) \nsubseteq S$ as desired.

(3) Let $P \in \text{PL}(\mathbb{C})$, by Lemma 4.20 $P$ is contained in a set of the form $(C \setminus c)$. Assume that no $T \subseteq S_{\text{max}}$ is contained in $(C \setminus c)$ and for any $T$ let $p_T$ be a witness of this fact. Note that $p_T \notin (C \setminus c)$ implies $p_T$ divides $c$. Then $a := \text{lcm}((p_T)_{T \subseteq S_{\text{max}}}) \in C$ but $a \div c = 1$, a contradiction. Hence, there is some $S_c \subseteq S_{\text{max}}$ that is contained in $(C \setminus c)$.

We show that $S_c$ already contains all primes in $P$. Let $p \in P \subseteq (C \setminus c)$. Then there is some $a \in C$ such that $a \div c = p$. Again $a$ is of the form $\text{lcm}((p_T)_{T \subseteq S_{\text{max}}})$. Note that, because all numbers in $C$ are square-free, no element from $S_c$ can divide $c$. Hence, $p_{S_c} = p$ and $p \in S_c$. From the fact that $S$ is a downset we derive that $P \subseteq S$ and $\text{PL}(\mathbb{C}) = S$ as desired.

An immediate consequence of the proof is the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.22.** Let $G$ be a smooth digraph. Then either $[G] = [K_3]$ or there is a finite disjoint union of cycles $C$, whose cycle lengths are square-free, such that $[G] = [C]$.

The classification from Theorem 4.21 suggests that the poset $\mathcal{P}_{\text{SD}}$ can be described lattice-theoretically, and Figure 7 is a good indication for where to look. Observe that the poset in Figure 7 (left) is isomorphic to the free distributive lattice on 3 generators $\mathcal{F}_D(3)$, after removing the top element. More general, whenever we restrict $\mathcal{P}_{\text{SD}}$ to disjoint union of cycles using only a fixed finite set of $n$ primes, then the resulting poset is isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}_D(n)$ (again, after removing the top element). However, this does not generalize to the whole poset, as for any finite smooth digraph $G$ we have that if $\text{PL}(G)$ is infinite, then $\text{PL}(G) = FP$.  

Figure 6: The isomorphism restricted to disjoint unions of cycles using only 2 and 3.
Consider the power set $2^X$ of a countably infinite set $X$ ordered by inclusion. We denote by $\mathcal{F}_D(\omega)$ the poset of all downsets of $2^X$ ordered by reverse inclusion. Markowsky proved that $\mathcal{F}_D(\omega)$ is the free completely distributive lattice, i.e., complete and distributive over infinite meets and joins, on countably many generators [10]. The generating set consists of the principal downsets generated by $X \setminus \{x\}$ for $x \in X$. If we choose $X$ to be the set of all primes, then the following corollary is an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.21.

**Corollary 4.23.** The map from $\mathcal{P}_{SD}$ to $\mathcal{F}_D(\omega)$ sending $G$ to $\mathrm{PL}(G) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ is a lattice embedding.

Note that, although this embedding does not preserve infinite meets, we have that $[K_3]$ is the only element whose image is infinite. Hence, we obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.24.** The poset $\mathcal{P}_{SD}$ is a completely distributive lattice.

### 5 Conclusion

The provided classification of $\mathcal{P}_{SD}$ has some properties that are inherited by $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}$. For instance, it follows that $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}$ contains an infinite antichain. Moreover, there is still hope that $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}$ is a lattice as well. In $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}$, we have $B \preceq A$ if and only if every height 1 condition that holds in $B$ holds in $A$ as well. If we only use prime cyclic loop conditions to compare
finite structures, then we get a quotient of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}$, denoted by $\mathcal{P}_{\text{pclc}}$, where $[B] \leq [A]$ if and only if $\text{PL}(B) \supseteq \text{PL}(A)$. Note that $\mathcal{P}_{\text{pclc}}$ is isomorphic $\mathcal{P}_{\text{SD}}$, hence, $\mathcal{P}_{\text{SD}}$ is both a subposet and a quotient of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}$. It might be interesting to study other classes of height 1 conditions and the arising quotients of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}$.

Another direction for future work is to drop the smoothness assumption and try to classify all finite digraphs with respect to pp-contractability.
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